REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-7 were rejected.

With this amendment, claim 5 is amended to correct for a grammar informality. Accordingly,

claims 1-7 remain at issue.

I.   35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kanevsky et al. (6,434,520). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant claims a method for locating an audio

segment within an audio file that requires the following limitations:

> *(i) providing a first transcribed text file associated with the audio file;*
> *(ii) providing a second transcribed text file associated with the audio file;*
> *(iii) receiving a user input defining a text segment corresponding to the audio*
>   *segment to be located;*
> *(iv) searching for the text segment in the first transcribed text file; and*
>
> *(v) displaying only those occurrences of the text segment within the first*
>   *transcribed text file that are also a match to occurrences of the text segment*
>   *within the second transcribed text file.*

In contrast, *Kanevsky* teaches a method for indexing audio/multimedia segments for

storage according to audio information such as speaker identity, background environment and

channel, transcription by speech recognition, and natural language understanding of segment

context or meaning. *See Kanevsky,* Abstract.

Contrary to the Examiner's statements, *Kanevsky* does not disclose all of the required

limitations of the claim 1 method for locating an audio segment within an audio file. In

particular, the Examiner asserts that *Kanevsky* discloses the claim 1 limitations of providing a

first transcribed text file (T1) associated with the audio file and providing a second transcribed

text file (T2) associated with the audio file (101).

Applicants respectively disagree. *Kanevsky* teaches a method of recognizing and

transcribing spoken utterances S1-SN (104) of the audio stream into corresponding transcription

T1-TN (110). The reference to T1 and TN is not to separate transcribed audio files, but to the

sequential transcription of S1-SN utterances into a single transcribed audio file. (*See Kanevsky,*

Col. 6 lines 39-47).

Further, *Kanevsky* does not teach or suggest "displaying only those occurrences of the

text segment within the first transcribed text file that are also a match to occurrences of the text

segment within the second transcribed text file" as required by claim 1. Applicants submit that

the portion of *Kanevsky* that the Examiner asserts discloses this limitation actually teaches a

plurality of methods "to retrieve segments associated with the unknown speaker" that is

unrelated to this claim 1 limitation. (*See Kanevsky,* Col. 10 lines 14-45).

For instance, *Kanevsky* discloses that the user can be prompted to browse the audio files

stored in the audio archive (step 411) and select a segment associated with the user (step 412).

Kanevsky further discloses that the stored voiceprint corresponding to the selected segment is

then compared with the stored voiceprints of all the audio segments (step 413) and the segments

with matching scores are retrieved (step 414). A speaker verification process is then performed

to accept or reject each retrieved segments based on the voiceprint of the selected segment (step

415) and the only verified segments are selected for output (step 416). (S*ee Kanevsky,* Col. 10

lines 14-45). But none of the methods disclosed by *Kanevsky* "to retrieve segments associated

with the unknown speaker" teach or suggest "displaying only those occurrences of the text

segment within the first transcribed text file that are also a match to occurrences of the text

segment within the second transcribed text file" as required by claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Applicants submit that *Kanevsky* fails to

teach or suggest (alone or in combination with other cited references) all the limitations of claim

1 and respectfully requests that the rejection to this claim be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 5-7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and should be deemed

allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In addition, Applicants submit that *Kanevsky* does not teach or suggest "comparing a first

transcribed text file to determine each match and difference between the first transcribed text file

and text segment in second transcribed text file" as required by claim 2. The portion of

Kanevsky the Examiner asserts teaches this limitation actually discloses searching an indexed

and stored audio file by inputting a suitable query. (*See Kanevsky*, Col. 8 line 49 - Col. 9, line

46). In particular, the portion of *Kanevsky* discloses that "query parameters can include any

combination of the indexed information such as speaker identify (ID tags), background/channel,

keywords/content and or/topics/NLU [natural language understanding] content." (*See Kanevsky*,

Col. 8 lines 63-66). *Kanevsky* further discloses that, for unknown speakers, the voiceprint may

be compared with "each of the stored voiceprints to retrieve segments having matching

voiceprints associated therewith." (*See Kanevsky*, Col. 9, lines 16-19). *Kanevsky* further teaches

that a user may input previously generated voiceprint of unknown speaker and compare it to the

audio, or browse the audio and compare stored acoustic information of one segment with stored

acoustic information of other segments. (*See Kanevsky*, Col. 9, lines 30-45). But *Kanevsky* fails

to disclose or suggest "comparing a first transcribed text file to determine each match and

difference between the first transcribed text file and text segment in second transcribed text file"
as required by claim 2. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Applicants respectfully request
that the rejection to claim 2 be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicants submit that step 414 disclosed in *Kanevsky* does not teach or
suggest "highlighting each match with the first transcribed text file being displayed in a first
window" as required by claim 5. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Applicants respectfully
request that the rejection to claim 5 be withdrawn. If the Examiner maintains this rejection,
Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner further clarify how step 414 teaches the
limitations of claim 5.

Kanevsky further does not teach or suggest that "each of the matching occurrences of the
text segment within the first transcribed text file are associated with one of a plurality of audio
tags, each audio tag corresponding to one of a plurality of audio segments within the audio file"
as required by claim 6. In constrast, *Kanevsky* teaches comparison of acoustic features
represented by "voiceprints." For example, Figs. 4A and 4B of *Kanevsky* disclose a flow
diagram of a method for retrieving stored audio segments. Fig. 4B references comparing a
voiceprint with stored voiceprints of segments (step 413) and retrieving "segments with
matching voiceprints (step. 414)." (*See Kanevsky* Col. 10, lines 10-20, Figs. 4A, 4B).

Accordingly, Applicants submit *Kanevsky* fails to teach or suggest associating matching
occurrences of the text segment of the first transcribed test file with an audio tag corresponding
to one of the audio segments of the audio file as required by claims 6 and 7. Accordingly, for
these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 6 and 7 be
withdrawn.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kanevsky in view of *Gandhi et al.* (US 2004/0015351). Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection.

Applicants submit that *Gandhi* is an improper prior art reference under 102 or 103.

Gandhi has an effective filing date of July 16, 2002. The present application was filed under 35

USC 371 from, and claims priority to, PCT international application WO 03/102920, which

claims priority to US provisional application no. 60/384,540, filed on May 30, 2002.

Accordingly, the present application has an effective filing date of May 30, 2002, which is earlier

than the July 16, 2002, filing date of *Gandhi*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 3 and 4 be

withdrawn.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>October 13, 2006</u>   By:_____/Thomas J. Burton/_____

Thomas J. Burton
Registration No. 47,464
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000